

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/620,619	NIVOROZHIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Taofiq A. Solola	Art Unit 1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to the telephone interview of 11/22/04.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-2, 14, 26 (now 1-4 respectively).
3. The drawings filed on _____ are accepted by the Examiner.
4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
 6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date <u>1</u> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____. 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____. |
|---|---|

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. The Markush group set forth in the claims includes both independent and distinct inventions, and patentably distinct compounds (or species) within each invention. However, this application discloses and claims a plurality of patentably distinct inventions far too numerous to list individually. Moreover, each of these inventions contains a plurality of patentably distinct compounds, also far too numerous to list individually. For these reasons provided below, restriction to one of the following Groups is required under 35 U.S.C. 121, wherein an Group is a set of patentably distinct inventions of a broad statutory category (e.g. Compounds, Methods of Use, Methods of Making, etc.):

- I. Claims 1-2, 14-15, drawn to compounds of formula (I) and composition thereof, classified in several heterocyclic classes (540, 544, 544, 548, 546) and non-heterocyclic classes (558, 562, etc.), numerous subclasses.
- II. Claims 3-13, 16-25, drawn to various methods of use, classified in classes 514, 548, 560, various subclasses.

2. In addition to an election of one of the inventions of group I-II above, restriction is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 as follows:

3. If groups II is elected, applicant must elect a specific disease(s), which have support in the specification via testing or journal articles.

In accordance with the decisions in *In re Harnisch*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984),

restriction of a Markush group is proper where the compounds within the group either (1) do not share a common utility, or (2) do not share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. In addition, a Markush group may encompass a plurality of independent and distinct inventions where two or more members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the other member(s) obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventors must be amended in compliance with 37C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37CFR 1.17(i).

If desired upon election of a single compound, applicants can review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the invention and can **set forth** a group of compounds, which are so similar within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the Markush group. See MPEP 608.01(p). Applicant should exercise caution in making a selection of a single member for each substituent group on the base molecule to be consistent with the written description.

Rationale Establishing Patentable Distinctiveness Within Each Group

Each Invention Set listed above is directed to or involves the use or making of compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse chemical structure, their different chemical properties, modes of action, different effects and reactive conditions (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that one invention would be obvious over either of the other inventions, i.e. they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures, which are similar are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrebuttable, but may be

overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holdings of Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

The above Groups represent general areas wherein the inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The inventions of groups I and II are related as product and methods of using respectively. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using the product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different utilities as demonstrated throughout the specification and various methods of use in group II, which are directed to different methods of using the product.

Each of the different methods of use of the invention set forth in Group is unrelated to others. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Methods of use are unrelated if one of three differences are found between them. These differences are 1) the population being treated, 2) the material being used, and 3) the methodology for treatment. If any one or more of these differences exist and are patentably distinct, then the methods are unrelated. In the instant case, the different methods of

use of the compounds are unrelated because the patient population treated for each disease is divergent.

In addition, because of the plethora of classes and subclasses in each of the Groups, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mathew Langer on 11/22/04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-2, 14-15,. Therefore, claims 3-13, 16-25 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR

1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mathew Langer on 11/22/04.

1. Claims 3-13, 15, 16-25 are canceled.
2. Claim 26 is added as follows:

A pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of a compound of claim 14 or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt or hydrate thereof and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or excipient.

Reasons for Allowance

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the invention relates to compounds of formulae (1a) and (1b), and composition thereof. The compounds were restricted in the parent Application No. 10/197,609, now allowed. No prior art of record discloses the instant compounds.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD, JD, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph McKane, can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.



TAOFIQ SOLOLA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 1626

November 22, 2004